

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is earnestly requested.

Claims 1-5, 10-11, and 15 have been amended as shown above. Claim 20 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso et al. (US 6,069,648) in view of Tseng et al. (US 5,815,759), claim 4 as being unpatentable over Suso in view of Tseng and further in view of Karube et al. (US App. 2001/0050711), claims 5-7 as being unpatentable over Suso in view of Tseng and Karube and further in view of Kohno et al. (US 5,993,101), claims 10 and 20 as being unpatentable over Suso in view of Tseng and Kohno, claims 12-13 as being unpatentable over Suso in view of Tseng and further in view of Kawagoe-shi (EP 1 170 517), and claim 14 as being unpatentable over Suso in view of Tseng and Kawagoe-shi, and further in view of Karube, claims 15-17 as being unpatentable over Suso in view of Tseng, Kawagoe-shi, and Karube, and further in view of Kohno. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant amends each of the independent claims 1, 10, and 11 substantially with the limitation "wherein the camera and the adjustment plate are operably connected by a central shaft, a right shaft, a left shaft, an upper shaft, and a lower shaft, each shaft being axially disposed within the hinge connection element providing the camera with the first, second, and third degrees of movement." (See, Claim 1.)

Suso teaches locating a rotatable camera on a terminal hinge. Tseng teaches mounting a camera on a ball joint ("A ball joint is utilized to connect the fourth lens set 63 and the fourth dumb-bell connection 64 and to provide the capability of spatial rotation between the fourth dumb-bell connection 64 and the fourth lens set 63.") See, Tseng, col. 5: 13-16. Combining Suso and Tseng, a camera is mounted on a rotatable hinge using a ball joint to provide at least three

degrees of motion. However, neither Suso nor Tseng teach an "adjustment plate are operably connected by a central shaft, a right shaft, a left shaft, an upper shaft, and a lower shaft, each shaft being axially disposed within the hinge connection element."

The Examiner relies upon Kohno to teach a "right shaft, a left shaft, an upper shaft, and a lower shaft." See, Office Action, June 22, 2007, pages 13-14. The Examiner states that it is obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Suso and Tseng with Kohno's 5-pin shaft "for the benefit of producing a coupling device which is still simple in structure, yet capable of **coping with a misalignment** between the axes of the camera and adjustment plate." As recited in the claim 1, the "the camera and the adjustment plate are operably connected by a central shaft, a right shaft, a left shaft, an upper shaft, and a lower shaft, ... providing the camera with the first, second, and third degrees of movement ." The shafts, as recited in the independent claims and described in the specification, enable the camera to be moved through three degrees of movement by manipulating the adjustment plate, not to couple misaligned shafts. Kohno does not teach "**shaft[s] ... providing ... degrees of movement.**"

As set forth in MPEP 2143, to show a *prima facie* case for obviousness, all the prior art references, either individually or combined, must teach all the claim limitations. Neither Suso, Tseng, nor Kohno, alone or in combination, "teach the camera and the adjustment plate are operably connected by a central shaft, a right shaft, a left shaft, an upper shaft, and a lower shaft, each shaft being axially disposed within the hinge connection element providing the camera with the first, second, and third degrees of movement," and applicants submit that a *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been shown and that claims 1, 10 and 11 are not obvious over the cited prior art, as are all their dependencies.

The other references cited by the Examiner, Karube and Kawagoe-shi, also fail to overcome this deficiency.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain at issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at (213) 623-2221.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: September 24, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Craig W. Schmoyer  
Registration No. 51,007  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884